

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 94 04:30:05 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #77  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 21 Feb 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    77

Today's Topics:

                    Hello

Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses) (2 msgs)  
                    Policy and Procedure in Bahama Islands ..  
                    What can be done about unlicensed 2-meter operation?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 20 Feb 1994 13:07:39 -0800  
From: agate!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa  
Subject: Hello  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

BONNIE\_FREELAND@gemstar2.uu.holonet.net (bonnie freeland) writes:

>lapevan@argo.bank.ash.alma.ata.su  
                    ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^  
                    ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

>Hello, my name is Bonnie and I am a good friend of smokeman. He gave me  
>your address and I thought I drop you a few lines.  
[ rest of "personals" deleted ]

PacketCluster alert! Thatsa some rare DX!

Maybe Ms. Bonnie is mistaking this newsgroup for alt.flames.  
It has lately been difficult to tell them apart :-).

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY      kchen@apple.com  
Apple Computer, Inc.

-----  
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 15:07:03 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!news.kei.com!  
world!drt@ames.arpa  
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:  
: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: > Okay, English is a language, but speech (or speech sounds) and writing  
: > and manual alphabet and morse, all of which can express English and  
: > other languages, are not. How's that? Well, there's still the  
: > expression "the spoken language is less formal than the written  
: > language" - does mathematical linguistics allow for such common  
: > usages? - so there must be the "morse language," too.

: >  
: > Well, no, that description's not quite right. Basic phonics and basic  
: > letter formation are like copying by hand. Fluency is a sort of  
: > automatic understanding. There's a spectrum of more "cipherlike" to  
: > more "languagelike" that applies to all this stuff. "Ciphers" - with  
: > painful, concentrated decoding - aren't "bad," they're merely a  
: > preliminary stage of mastery. When people say, "morse is a language,"  
: > we can interpret that to mean "you can develop that same automatic,  
: > painless fluency for morse language that you can for written, or  
: > spoken, or signed, language - and it's a joy to do so." Not, "morse  
: > is like French in having a separate grammar from English."

: I have heard people expound the greatness of Morse Encryption by telling  
: everyone that they had a "QSO with a guy in France now I would have to  
: learn French or he would have to learn English to do that on SSB, see  
: how wonderfull CW is". And I have heard this more than once.

True, and it is fun to do that, but not much of a point for morse,  
really. The same result could be achieved if everyone had to learn  
QSO English, or QSO French, or QSO Finnish, or QSO Esperanto, putting  
the same amount of time in, couldn't it? (Incidentally, was it  
English or French that was the language encrypted in that contact?)

: >  
: > I'm afraid the strict linguistic term is too narrow for our purposes.

: > That's okay, - linguists don't have a monopoly on setting terms.  
: >  
: > But, haven't we really gotten off the point - that all these forms of  
: > language are conditioned responses, and that memorization is needed  
: > for all of them, but that doesn't necessarily make them contemptible?  
: > Dan heaped contempt on all mere conditioned responses - compared  
: > developing them to surrendering one's humanity (by becoming dogs,  
: > presumably). But I can't figure out how he typed his post in without  
: > using a number of them.  
: >  
: > -drt

: Dan did what? Humm... More like;

: Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote (replying to Ed Hare):

: >Ed, the only thing I would take exception to (and you mentioned it) is  
: >that morse is an encryption method not a language. And it IS memorized  
: >the fact that you have limited time to respond is a conditioned response  
: >again, not learned. Conditioned. Any one remember Dr. Pavlov?

: I didn't realize that the above was heaping contempt on conditioned  
: responses.

Sure. The Pavlov crack gives the game away. The mental image of  
people learning code is subserviant salivating dogs, and it's a pretty  
clear image. You really didn't find that contemptuous, especially  
given the tone of this and your other posts on the topic? Even on  
second reading?

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker KG2S drt@world.std.com

-----  
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 15:32:33 GMT  
From: world!drt@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:  
: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: > Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:  
: > : drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: >  
: > : > But all these points tell against the Roman alphabet, do they not?  
: > : > Yet written language is not encryption. Or is it? You neglected to  
: > : > say. Maybe we can agree that morse bears most resemblance to a cipher  
: > : > at 5 wpm, and gradually becomes more like spelling aloud (as opposed  
: > : > to spelling on paper, i.e., writing), or even an aural form of the  
: > : > manual alphabet, when you can copy whole words without having to write  
: > : > it down?  
: >  
: > : So morse is slang english? ...  
: >  
: > Why the sarcastic response to a conciliatory post?  
: >  
: > : ...Is ASCII or EBCDIC? No, it is an encryption  
: > : method that uses (according to this discussion) a wetware modem. Period.  
: >  
: > But the question you ignored while merely restating your claim is: Is  
: > writing just the same thing, "an encryption method that uses a wetware  
: > modem?" And furthermore, doesn't that mean you believe mastering  
: > writing to be undesirable for that reason? If not, why not?

: The question is not, is written english a language,

Yes, it is, and I'll tell you why.

: the question is; Is  
: morse code a language. By its self, without english. And if it is then  
: can we say the same about ASCII.

And the alphabet.

If "written English" is a language, then "morse English" is a language.

If "Morse English" is not a language, then "written English" is not  
a language.

But knowledgeable people continually speak of "written English" as a  
language, even though the alphabet clearly is not. Therefore ....

If you agree here that written English is a language, you're stuck.  
But you don't see any way to argue that written English is not, in  
some sense of the word, a language. The "out"? It's not "the  
question." But, logically, it is.

I've tried to draw the distinction between learning the letters, morse  
or written, and the language, either morse or written. But you would  
have none of it. I will agree that the alphabet is a cipher if you  
will concede that, at a certain stage of fluency, morse English



Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 18:46:17 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!udel!gvls1!  
rossi@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: What can be done about unlicensed 2-meter operation?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

One morning in mid-January, in the middle of all of the messy weather we were having, my scanner stopped on an out-of-the-way 2 meter FM simplex channel that a friend and I often use. I heard one side of a conversation. A female voice. The conversation went on for a good 15-20 minutes during which time the voice never identified. I could not hear who she was talking to but from what she was saying, the best I could figure, she was some guy's wife (at home and unlicensed) talking to her husband out driving around in all the ice. As the conversation continued it drifted towards a less urgent content. She rambled on about several subjects that were not related to the hazardous road conditions.

Not knowing any of the details of their circumstance, and given the severity of the weather and road conditions, I didn't think too much of the whole thing. I figured that it probably was a one time incident and let it drop.

But... a few days later during the next storm I heard the same voice again. This time I heard the "wife" apparently calling her husband using the following procedure:

N3XYZ QSL? ... N3XYZ QSL? ... N3XYZ QSL? ... Over and over.

QSL? (!) This sounded suspicious and perked my interest. She eventually established contact with someone (I assume the same mobile station as before) and talked for a several minutes, but never identified. Since then I have heard her at least two more times and my friend has also heard her. I have the actual callsign of the station she was "calling". I would guess that it was issued about 6 months ago, but none of the callbook servers are up to date enough to confirm this.

I am trying to decide what to do about this. For now, I am continuing to listen hoping to gather more clues as to where/who this person is. The signal is fairly strong but does not sound like it is in the immediate area. I have never heard any traces of the mobile station she is talking to -- yet.

If I could hear the mobile station (licensed?) I would rather confront him first. He should know better.

What is the best way to handle stuff like this? Does the FCC really care?

=====

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA

rossi@vfl.paramax.COM

Unisys Corporation - Government Systems Group  
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

=====

-----

Date: 20 Feb 1994 10:36:10 -0600

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!

uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2k672t\$1op@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu>, <2k68im\$am6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<CLIKx5.MDJ@news.hawaii.edu>for-

Subject : Re: Bad Radiographers (was: Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS)

In article <CLIKx5.MDJ@news.hawaii.edu>,

Jeff Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> wrote:

>In article <2k68im\$am6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x  
ray technician!) writes:

>>

>>--

>>Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are  
>>great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

>>

>> --Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

>

>What an unusual statement. Did she mean to imply that there are some radio-  
>graphers who are NOT able to use a radiographic machine? Frightening.

Yes. They are the ones who whine and complain that they shouldn't have to  
learn math to calculate the correct MaS, or they shouldn't have to learn  
positioning to correctly position the patient. Isn't it strange how  
radiography imitates amateur radio?

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are  
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

-----

Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 15:45:38 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!

news.kei.com!world!drt@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CLF6M5.879@world.std.com>, <85NyHc6w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
<2k3gmd\$nsk@ncar.ucar.edu>  
Subject : Re: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)

Kim Elmore (elmore@rap.ucar.edu) wrote:

: Really, I don't see the point of the "Morse is a language! No  
: it isn't!" debate. As Ed Hare (KA1CV) so eloquently pointed out,  
: either it is relevant to Amateur Radio, or it isn't. \*This\* is the  
: point that merits debate. It's similarity or lack of it to language  
: is a Red Herring.

Well, I'm sorry you don't see the point of the "sub-thread," Kim, but  
it isn't really "who's right about the code requirement." I think the  
question, more than red herring, is interesting in and of itself, and  
I'm learning more talking with people in this thread than I do from  
your run-of-the-mill code wars. I'm sorry others don't - we aim to  
please - and nothing prevents a good, polite, well-reasoned discussion  
of the code requirement at the same time. I agree with you that  
whether morse is a "language" or a "cipher" or whatever doesn't much  
matter in that debate.

I'll try to remember to change the thread name in any future posts  
on the subject. :->

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker KG2S           drt@world.std.com

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #77

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*